

In re Application of:

Lisa PAIGE et al.

Serial No.: 09/429,331

Filed: October 28, 1999

For: METHOD OF PREDICTING...

Art Unit:

Examiner:

Washington, D.C.

February 23, 2000

Docket No.: PAIGE=1D

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT [IDS]

Honorable Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

This Information Disclosure Statement is submitted in accordance with 37 C.F.R. 1.97, 1.98, and it is requested that the information set forth in this statement and in the listed documents be considered during the pendency of the aboveidentified application, and any other application relying on the filing date of the above-identified application or crossreferencing it as a related application.

- This IDS should be considered, in accordance with 37 C.F.R. 1.97, as it is filed:
- [] A. within three months of the filing date of the above-identified national application or within three months of the entry into the national stage of the above-identified international application.
- [] B. before the mailing date of a first office action on the merits.
- C. [X] after (A) and (B) above, but before final rejection or allowance, and Applicants have made the necessary certification (box "i" below) or paid the necessary fee (box "ii" below).

In re Appl. No.: 09/429,331

- [X] i. Counsel certifies that, upon information and belief, each item of information listed herein was either (a) cited in a communication from a foreign patent office in a counterpart foreign application not more than three months prior to the filing of this IDS or (b) was not cited in a communication from a foreign patent office in a counterpart foreign application and was not known to any individual designated in 1.56(c) more than three months prior to the filing of this IDS.
- [] ii. A check for the fee set forth in 1.17(p), presently believed to be \$240, is enclosed (check no. _____).
- [] D. after (A), (B) and (C) above, but before payment of the issue fee. Applicant petitions under 37 C.F.R. 1.97(d) for consideration of this IDS. A check for the fee set forth in 1.17(i)(1), presently believed to be \$130 is enclosed (check no. _________). Counsel certifies that, upon information and belief, each item of information listed herein was either (i) cited in a communication from a foreign patent office in a counterpart foreign application not more than three months prior to the filing of this IDS or (ii) was not cited in a communication from a foreign patent office in a counterpart foreign application and was not known to any individual designated in 1.56(c) more than three months prior to the filing of this IDS.
- 2. In accordance with 37 C.F.R. 1.98, this IDS includes a list (e.g., form PTO-1449) of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the office, either incorporated into this IDS or as an attachment hereto. A copy of each document is attached, except as explained below.

In re Appl. No.: 09/429,331

- [] A. Documents ______ are deemed substantially cumulative to documents ______, and, in accordance with 1.98(c), only a copy of each of the latter documents is enclosed.
- [] B. Certain documents were previously cited by or submitted to the Office in the following prior application(s), which are relied upon under 35 U.S.C. 120:

[insert serial number/filing date]

Applicants identify these documents by attaching hereto copies of the form PTO-892s and PTO-1449s from the files of the prior applications or a fresh PTO-1449 listing these documents, and request that they be considered and made of record in accordance with 1.98(d). Per 37 CFR 1.98(d), copies of these documents need not be filed in this application. If copies of any of these documents cannot be found in the files of the prior applications, the Examiner is requested to so notify counsel before taking action in this case, so replacement copies can be submitted. While an IDS filed under \$1.97 must contain a "list of all patents, publications or other information submitted for consideration by the Office", see \$1.98(a) (1), the only requirement for the list is that it provide the information set forth in \$1.98(b). There is no requirement that a form PTO-1449 be used (MPEP \$609 merely says that use of this form is "encouraged") and no prohibition on submitting a copy of a form PTO-1449 or form PTO-892 from a prior case. Indeed, the re-use of such forms is desirable as it avoids error in transferring the information, and evidences that the reference was considered in a prior application. A previously accepted PTO-1449, or an examiner-prepared PTO-892, necessarily complies with \$1.98(b).

[] 3. Documents _____ are not in the English language. In accordance with 1.98(c), Applicants state:

In re Appl. No.: 09/429,331											
[] documents already contain an English											
language abstract, summary or claim set.											
[] a publicly available abstract is attached to each											
of documents, and the source of each											
abstract is indicated thereon.											
[] documents are patents or published											
patent applications for which counterpart English											
language patents or patent applications exist, and											
are enclosed, as follows:											
Foreign Lang. Doc.# English Lang. Doc.#											
[insert] [insert]											
[] applicants have prepared an English translation o											
at least the pertinent portions of documents											
, and copies are attached.											
[] A concise explanation of the relevance of											
documents is found in the attached											
search report from the Patent Office											
(see reply to Comment 68 in the preamble to the											
final rules; 1135 OG 13 at 20).											
[] A concise explanation of the relevance of											
documents is set forth as follows:											
[Insert concise explanation of relevance]											
4. No explanation of relevance is necessary for											
documents in the English language (see reply to Comments 67 and											
68 in the preamble to the final rules; 1135 OG 13 at 20).											
5. Other information being provided for the examiner's consideration follows:											
Enclosed herewith is the corresponding											
International Search Report PCT/US 99/06664.											
6. In accordance with 37 C.F.R. 1.97(g) and (h), the											
filing of this IDS should not be construed as a representation											

that a search has been made or that information cited is, or is

In re Appl. No.: 09/429,331

considered to be, material to patentability as defined in §1.56 (b), or that any cited document listed or attached is (or constitutes) prior art. Unless otherwise indicated, the date of publication indicated for an item is taken from the face of the item and Applicant reserves the right to prove that the date of publication is in fact different.

7. The Commissioner is hereby authorized and requested to charge any additional fees which may be required in connection with this application or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-4035.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C. Attorneys for Applicant

Ву:

Iver P. Cooper Reg. No. 28,005

624 Ninth Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20001 Telephone: (202) 628-5197 Facsimile: (202) 737-3528

IPC:nmp

f:\user19\wp\n-q\pai331us.ids

SHEET 1 OF 1

Office 1 of 1													
FORM PTO-1	U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE							ATTY DOCKET NO: PAIGE = 1D			SERIAL NO: 09/429,331		
LIST OF DOCUMENTS CITED BY APPLICANT (Use several sheets if necessary)							NT		APPLICANT: Lisa PAIGE et al.				
									FILING DATE	: October 28, 199	GROUP:		
FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS (include at least document number, publication date and country)													
		DOCUMENT NUMBER							DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUB- CLASS	TRANSLATION YES/NO
	AA	9	7	1	5.	5	8	6	01MAY97	WIPO	·		
JC163	АВ	9	7	3	1	6	4	6	04SEP97	WIPO			
3 2000	a AC												
CO.	AD				<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u></u>	.,.					
OTHER DOCUMENTS (include author, title, name of publication, volume, pages & date of publication)													
PATENT & THE	ΑE	McDonnell, D.P., et al., "Analysis of Estrogen Receptor Function in Vitro Reveals Three Distinct Classes of Antiestrogens," MOLECULAR ENDOCRINOLOGY 9(6):659-669 (1995)											
	AF	Norris, J.D., et al., "Peptide Antagonists of the Human Estrogen Receptor," SCIENCE 285(5428):744-746 (1999)											
	AG	Paige, L.A., et al., "Estrogen Receptor (ER) Modulators Each Induce Distinct Conformational Changes in ER α and ER β," PROC. NATL. ACAD. SCI. U.S.A. 96(7):3999-4004 (1999)											
	АН												
	Al												
	AJ												
	AK												
EXAMINER									DATE CONSIDERED				
EXAMINER: Initial if reference considered. Draw line through citation if not in conformance and not considered. Include copy of this form with next communication to applicant.													

· ...

.

.

10